

of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order in place of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

ADMINISTRATION UNVEILS TRANSPORTATION FUNDING PLAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, today the Bush administration unveiled its transportation funding plan for the next 6-year surface transportation bill. It is pathetically inadequate. If you look at the inventory of needs across the United States of America, the crumbling bridges, the crumbling highways, the congestion, the need for investment, the President and his staff believe that this budget should be flat-lined. We can't afford the investment, they tell us. We can't afford to invest more in roads, bridges and highways, in high-speed rail and congestion mitigation. We just can't afford it. Oh, we can afford massive tax cuts for the wealthy, but if we are going to have massive tax cuts for the wealthy, his number one job creation proposal, we can't afford to create real jobs, jobs in the construction industry.

By his own measure, by the measure of the Bush administration Department of Transportation, every \$1 billion spent on transportation infrastructure and construction produces 47,000 jobs in the United States of America. If the President would just increase his proposal to come close to that being made by the Republican Chair of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, they would create 705,000 new jobs a year in the United States of America; real jobs, construction jobs and related jobs in small businesses, and suppliers for those construction companies.

□ 1630

Instead, they want to engage in the charade of producing jobs through trickle-down economics and tax cuts. It did not work in the 1980's for Ronald Reagan. It did not work for George Bush the First, and it is not going to

work for this George Bush. In fact, his first tax cuts, which were record tax cuts, have not produced any jobs. We have lost nearly a million jobs since his first tax cuts. They have lots of excuses why we have lost those jobs since his record tax cuts went into effect. Mostly Bill Clinton, a few other things, world events; but they have got people to blame, and they are saying since those tax cuts did not work, let us borrow money from the Social Security trust Fund, from the Medicare trust fund; let us borrow money to fund more tax cuts because that is what we have to do now.

When we did that first set of tax cuts, we supposedly had a surplus. We no longer have a surplus. We have a huge and growing deficit. We are accumulating debt by more than \$1 billion a day; \$1 billion a day we are adding to the future debt of the young people of this country. And they want to borrow more money to finance tax cuts for woefully few people, an average of \$105,000 for every millionaire. But somehow they think that \$105,000 granted to every millionaire in this country in tax cuts will put more people to work than \$1 billion invested in crumbling bridges, roads, and highways.

It is pretty simple. We could put people back to work. We could make this a more productive country. We could make our transportation system work better. But, no. Tax cuts for precious few political campaign contributors are more important to this administration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MUSGRAVE addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the Special Order time of the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

NATURE CONSERVANCY AND PUTTING AMERICAN WORKERS FIRST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to briefly mention two very unrelated topics, but two things very important to the national scene. The front page of The Washington Post a few days ago had this headline: "Non-

profit Sells Scenic Acreage to Allies at a Loss. Buyers Gain Tax Breaks with Few Curbs on Land Use." And I would like for the Members to listen to the first few paragraphs of this story from the front page of The Washington Post. It says: "On New York's Shelter Island, the Nature Conservancy 3 years ago bought an undeveloped, 10-acre tract overlooking the Mashomack Preserve, an oasis of hardwoods and tidal pools located just a stone's skip from the exclusive Hamptons. Cost to the charity: \$2.1 million." That is what the Nature Conservancy purchased this land for.

"Seven weeks later it resold the land, with some development restrictions, to James Dougherty, former chairman of the charity's regional chapter, and his wife, Nancy, a trustee of the conservancy's preserve. Cost to the Doughertys: \$500,000.

"The transaction follows a pattern seen in conservancy land deals across the Nation. Time and again the non-profit has bought raw land and resold it at a loss to a trustee or supporter."

And what this article tells about, it tells about similar deals in Massachusetts, Kentucky, and other places across the country where the Nature Conservancy has bought land at a huge cost, \$2.1 million in this case, and resold it to a member of their board or a strong supporter at a great loss, \$500,000, for instance, in this \$2.1 million deal, some of the most beautiful land in this Nation. People across this country need to know that the Nature Conservancy is doing these types of sweetheart deals for its board members and other favored people around the country.

The other unrelated topic, Madam Speaker, another very important concern of mine is the fact that we keep on sending so many jobs to other countries. Just before the break, I spoke about another story from The Washington Post which told that one of the biggest exports we have in this country now is with the white collar or technical-type jobs, and it told that over the next decade we are going to lose at least 3 million or more white collar or technical jobs to places like India, China, and other countries.

The gurus or the supporters of high tech told us for years that we did not need to worry about losing the factory jobs and the lower-wage jobs to other countries, that we would be a service economy or that we would have the more educated type of jobs. Now we are losing those at a very alarming pace. And when I graduated from college, people could get good jobs with bachelor's degrees. Now young people are being forced to go to graduate school and sometimes are not even finding jobs when they have master's degrees or Ph.D. degrees, and that is why we find so many people in graduate school or even with graduate degrees working as waiters and waitresses around the country. And if we do not stop this, we are going to have a real problem in this country.

And Paul Craig Roberts, who is a nationally syndicated columnist, one of our most respected columnists and was a former assistant Secretary of the Treasury under President Reagan, a very conservative Republican, he wrote a few days ago, he said in the last 27 months: "The U.S. economy has lost 2.6 million private sector jobs. Much of this loss is from the fall in profits and subsequent downsizing after the high-tech bust. Some lost jobs, however, are from a new development: America's export of high-wage jobs to low-wage countries.

"The collapse of the Soviet Union, China's 'capitalist road,' and privatizations in formerly socialist economies made it reasonably safe for U.S. firms to locate capital and technology abroad to employ foreign labor to produce for the U.S. market. The main incentive to take production offshore is the availability of labor at wages far below the U.S. rate.

"Foreign labor can be hired at a fraction of U.S. cost, because the standard of living is much lower in China, India, and other Asian countries. These countries have a labor supply that is large relative to demand, making it possible to employ people at wages considerably less than the value of their contribution to output."

And it goes on in this column, Madam Speaker, and says: "Thus the very process that helps U.S. firms become more profitable and price competitive worsens the U.S. trade deficit, lowers U.S. employment and GDP growth and puts pressure on the value of the dollar.

"The growing ability of U.S. employers to substitute cheaper foreign labor for U.S. labor is putting pressure on U.S. wages and salaries. On April 26 The New York Times reported that real earnings of those in the top 10 percent fell 1.4 percent over the last year. The real weekly pay for the median worker fell 1.5 percent.

"Another indication of the pressure on U.S. employment is the growing number of discouraged job seekers who have dropped out of the labor force. The 6 percent unemployment rate does not include those too discouraged to seek jobs."

If we do not start putting American workers first once again, Madam Speaker, we are going to have a real problem in this country.

A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY MUST RELY ON DIVERSITY OF OPINION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HINCHEY. Madam Speaker, I would like this evening once again to bring to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives an action which will be taken by the Federal Communications Commission on June 2, now just a little more than 2 weeks away. This is a very critical action,

and it will be a controversial one. It will be controversial within the Federal Communications Commission itself in that the vote is likely to be three to two. The three Republican members of the Communications Commission will vote for this measure, and the two Democrats will vote against it. This measure will continue a program that was advanced initially in the 1980's which is bringing about the increasing consolidation of the American Communications System into the hands of fewer and fewer people.

For example, as a result of actions taken during the Reagan administration and subsequent actions taken, we now have a situation in the United States where 80 percent of the radio audience is listening to stations that are owned by just several companies. One company owns radio stations, 1,220 of them, all across America. This situation is critical because it is antithetical to a democratic society.

When the Federal Communications Commission was established back in the 1930's, it was established in order to ensure that there would be a broad diversity of opinion expressed on radio, which was at that time of course the principal electronic means of communication. This position taken by the FCC and by the Congress which established it was informed by events that took place in Europe in the 1930's. Fascist governments in Germany, in Spain, and Italy had come to power by increasingly consolidating the means of communication; and once they were in power, they completed that consolidation, and it was through that consolidation that they remained in power in those countries.

We here in the United States, recognizing that situation, set up a program whereby we would ensure there would be local voices first on radio and then subsequently on television when that developed into the next important electronic medium of communication. But beginning in the 1980's, the Reagan administration advanced principles which allowed a handful of companies to increasingly own more and more radio stations, more and more television stations, and to dominate the public discourse, the public discussion, that was taking place in specific areas around the country. As a result of that, we have less local news on many local radio stations and television stations; people have a difficult time finding out what is going on in their community by listening to their local radio stations. Often the programming in those radio stations takes place thousands of miles away and has no relationship whatsoever to what is happening in those communities. There is no local voice, no local news voice, no local voice about what is happening in those communities as a result. And also, of course, we are finding uniformity in these communications media.

Now the Federal Communications Commission is taking the next step, or they want to take the next step. That

is the Republican-dominated communications commission, the three members, want to take the next step, and that is to allow in addition to the radio stations and the television stations in a broadcast area to be owned by a single entity, a single corporation, they now want to allow a system which will also allow for the newspaper in that media market to be owned by the same company.

This is a very dangerous situation. A democratic society must rely upon diversity of opinion. No one single person, no one corporation, no one entity has a patent on the truth. The way that we arrive at the truth in the United States of America is by the conflux of voices, by people expressing their opinions, expressing their views, and those views being heard and then people being elected on the basis of those diverse opinions. All of that is increasingly in jeopardy as a result of the actions that have been and continue to be taken by the Federal Communications Commission.

I am introducing a resolution to the House of Representatives sponsored by 72 Members of the House. That resolution calls upon the FCC to halt this process. I urge Members to come forward and support that resolution.

THE HIGH COST OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Madam Speaker, I come to the well of the House again tonight to talk about an issue that is an enormous issue particularly for seniors and that is the high cost of prescription drugs here in the United States. Today I received a copy of a new book by Katharine Greider, and the title of the book is "The Big Fix, How the Pharmaceutical Industry Rips Off American Consumers." Ms. Greider has done amazing research in terms of what is happening in the prescription industry here in the United States, and it is not a pretty picture. In fact, one of the most troubling statistics she came up with as she did her research is that 29 percent of the prescriptions written in the United States are not filled because people cannot afford them. And here we have our own FDA, the Food and Drug Administration, which literally is treating law-abiding citizens like common criminals simply because they want to go to a foreign country to buy drugs that they need.

Let me give an example. We talked about this before. There is a drug called Tamoxifen. Tamoxifen is a miracle drug and I sort of have a love-hate relationship with some of the people in the pharmaceutical industry because Tamoxifen is a miracle drug, and it has saved lots of American women from breast cancer.

□ 1645

It is the most effective drug we have found. But the interesting thing is